CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

| Investigator: | | Team: | CCRB Case #: | | Force | $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ | Discourt. | ☐ U.S. |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|-------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Anthony Pascual | | Team # 1 | 201500837 | Ø | Abuse | | O.L. | ☐ Injury |
| Incident Date(s) | | Location of Incident: | | I | Precinct: | 18 | Mo. SOL | EO SOL |
| Wednesday, 02/04/2015 8:00 PM | | Nevins Street Subway S | Station | | 88 | 8 | 3/4/2016 | 8/4/2016 |
| Date/Time CV Reported | | CV Reported At: | How CV Reported: | | Date/Time | Rece | eived at CCF | RB |
| Wed, 02/04/2015 9:38 PM | | CCRB | Phone | | Wed, 02/04 | 4/201 | 5 9:38 PM | |
| Complainant/Victim | Type | Home Addre | SS | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Subject Officer(s) | Shield | TaxID | Command | | | | | |
| 1. POM Joseph Schwaner | 17838 | 929152 | TB DT30 | | | | | |
| 2. POM Thomas Marksberry | 28033 | 927605 | TB DT30 | | | | | |
| Officer(s) | Allegatio | on | | | Inve | stiga | ator Recon | nmendation |
| A.POM Thomas Marksberry | | O Thomas Marksberry r d number to ^{§ 87(2)(b)} | refused to provide hi | is na | ame | | | |
| B.POM Thomas Marksberry | Discourte toward § | esy: PO Thomas Marksb | perry acted discourte | eous | ly | | | |
| | § 87(2)(g), § 87 | (4-b) | | | | | | |
| § 87(2)(b) | | § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) | | | | | | |
| § 87(2)(b) | § 87(2)(g), § 87 | (4-b) | | | | | | |

Case Summary

| On February 4, 2015, at approximately 8:00 p.m., in the Nevins Street Subway Station |
|--|
| (Manhattan-bound platform for the 2,3,4,5 trains) in Brooklyn, §87(2)(b) was stopped |
| by PO Joseph Schwaner, of Transit District 30, for smoking an electronic cigarette within the |
| subway station. §87(2)(b) video recorded the incident on his cellphone from the beginning. PO |
| Thomas Marksberry, of Transit District 30, was working with PO Schwaner and stood off to the |
| side while PO Schwaner asked \$87(2)(b) for identification several times. After a few minutes, |
| PO Marksberry started to approach \$87(2)(b) and PO Schwaner. \$87(2)(b) pointed his |
| cellphone towards PO Marksberry and asked him for his name and shield number. PO |
| Marksberry responded, "I am not giving you nothing." (Allegation A). PO Marksberry then |
| removed his cellphone from his pocket, approached with his cellphone held out, and |
| placed his cellphone in close proximity to service cellphone. Ser(2)(b) expressed his |
| discomfort with PO Marksberry's actions and asked him to back away. PO Marksberry |
| disregarded § 87(2)(b) requests and continued to hold his phone in close proximity to 87(2) |
| PO Marksberry then mocked by repeating \$87(2)(b) requests that he |
| back away, word for word, back to him (Allegation B). §87(2)(b) was released without a |
| summons. § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) |
| |
| |
| did not cooperate with the investigation (encl. G1); however, \$87(2)(b) |
| provided video evidence of this interaction (encl. G2-6). |
| |
| Case number 201500997 was created as a spin off to the Office of the Chief of |
| Department regarding PO Marksberry recording §87(2)(b) on his cellphone. |
| Mediation, Notice of Claim, and Criminal Histories |
| viediation. Notice of Claim, and Criminal Histories |
| |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer sar(2)(b) mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer sar(2)(b) mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |
| This case was eligible for mediation; however, the investigation did not have the opportunity to offer mediation since he did not cooperate with the investigation. As of April 2, 2015, a request for any Notice of Claim associated with this complaint is pending with the NYC Comptroller's Office (encl. K1-2). |

Page 2 CCRB Case # 201500837

| 0 | § 87(2)(b) |
|---|------------|
| | |
| | |

- PO Marksberry has been a member of the service for 14 years and there are no substantiated CCRB allegations against him (encl. C1).
- PO Schwaner has been a member of the service for 13 years and there are no substantiated CCRB allegations against him (encl. C2).

Findings and Recommendations

| Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to \$87(2)(b) |
|--|
| on the subway platform. Individuals are not allowed to use electronic cigarettes in the subway system. NYC Administrative Code 17-503(a)(2) (encl. A9-12). was not cooperative with the investigation. As a result, did not confirm or deny that he was smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. However, in a previous case (CCRB case number 201410262), acknowledged smoking an electronic cigarette in a public park. Therefore, the investigation concludes that smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to |
| was not cooperative with the investigation. As a result, sar(2)(b) did not confirm or deny that he was smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. However, in a previous case (CCRB case number 201410262), acknowledged smoking an electronic cigarette in a public park. Therefore, the investigation concludes that was smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to |
| did not confirm or deny that he was smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. However, in a previous case (CCRB case number 201410262), acknowledged smoking an electronic cigarette in a public park. Therefore, the investigation concludes that smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to smoking and smoking an |
| electronic cigarette in the subway. However, in a previous case (CCRB case number 201410262), acknowledged smoking an electronic cigarette in a public park. Therefore, the investigation concludes that smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to smoking and smoking a |
| acknowledged smoking an electronic cigarette in a public park. Therefore, the investigation concludes that was smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to \$87(2)(b) |
| was smoking an electronic cigarette in the subway. Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to [8,87(2)(b)] |
| Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: PO Thomas Marksberry refused to provide his name and shield number to \$87(2)(b) |
| name and shield number to \$87(2)(b) |
| |
| |
| Allegation B – Discourtesy- Action: PO Thomas Marksberry acted discourteously |
| toward 8 87(2)(b) |
| It is undisputed based on video that § 87(2)(b) requested PO Schwaner's name, shield |
| number, and command, and PO Marksberry's name and shield number. It is undisputed that PO |
| Schwaner provided his name and shield number and that PO Marksberry responded to the |
| request by stating, "I am not giving you nothing." PO Marksberry did not provide his name and |
| shield number after stating the above. It is also undisputed that PO Marksberry removed his |
| cellphone from his pocket, approached with his cellphone held out, and placed his |
| cellphone in close proximity to \$87(2)(b) cellphone. \$87(2)(b) expressed his discomfort |
| with PO Marksberry's actions and asked him to back away. PO Marksberry disregarded [37(2)] |
| requests and continued to hold his phone in close proximity to PO |
| Marksberry then mimicked \$\frac{\mathbb{S}^{\mathbb{R}7(2)(b)}}{\mathbb{D}}\$ by repeating \$\frac{\mathbb{S}^{\mathbb{R}7(2)(b)}}{\mathbb{S}}\$ statements word for word. |
| repeatedly talked over the officers during the incident. |
| PO Marksberry explained that he did not provide his name and shield to because |
| he believed that strain was trying to bait him and PO Schwaner into playing his game, |
| which PO Marksberry refused to do. PO Marksberry mimicked \$87(2)(b) as he believed that |
| was invading his personal space in that \$87(2)(b) was filming him and holding his |
| cellphone close to PO Marksberry's face. PO Marksberry did not film §87(2)(6) but he |
| pretended to record to see § 87(2)(b) s reaction. |
| Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 states that officers are to provide their name, shield number, |
| and command when asked by a civilian as well as to act courteously and respectfully during |
| interactions with civilians (encl. A1) |
| § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g) |
| IS 87/21/h) |
| 8 87(2)(h) |
| |
| K |

Page 3 **CCRB Case # 201500837**

| 87(2)(g) | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | |
| 8 87/2)/h) § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b) | | |
| ห หาเวนทา | | |
| K 87/21/h1 | | |
| 7/2'uni | | |
| | | 8 97/2\/h\ |
| | | |
| | | 8 87/21/h1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| S 27 | (/2)/h) | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | _ |
| | | |
| _ | | |
| eam: One | | |
| | | |
| | Anthony Dogguel | |
| nvestigator: Signature | Anthony Pascual Print | Date |
| | | |
| upervisor: Title/Signature | Print | |
| Tine/Signature | 111111 | Date |
| eviewer: | | — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — |
| Title/Signature | Print | Date |
| eviewer: | | |
| Title/Signature | Print | Date |